DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 476 CS 500 123

AUTHOR Ritter, Kurt W.
TITLE The Myth-Making Function of the Rhetoric of the American Revolution: Francis Hopkinson as a Case Study.
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Assn. (58th, Chicago, December 27-30, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Colonial History (United States); Essays; *Mythology; Nationalism; *Persuasive Discourse; Political Influences; Propaganda; *Revolutionary War (United States); *Rhetoric; *United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Hopkinson (Francis)

ABSTRACT

The author suggests a critical approach to the rhetoric of the American Revolution focusing on the concept of "myth-making. This operates in revolutionary rhetoric when the revolutionist creates a spiritual dynamism for his movement through appeals that suggest the sanction of supra-rational forces. The author applies this concept to the persuasive literature of an American Revolutionary propagandist, Francis Hopkinson. He reveals a close interaction of aggressive rhetoric and unifying rhetoric, operating to generate an American identity, which included a shared vision of both the national character and the destiny of America. He points to such words as "liberty," "genius," and "commerce," as unifying symbols or the ultimate terms of that period. He suggests that in order to grasp the full significance of American Revolutionary rhetoric, scholars focus their attention on the myth-making function. He concludes that the rhetoric of the Revolution was more than manipulated; it expressed ideas with personal significance to both rhetors and auditors--ideas with perhaps lasting impact on the future development of American public address. (Author/RN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072476

THE MYTH-MAKING FUNCTION OF THE RHETORIC OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: FRANCIS HOPKINSON AS A CASE STUDY

Kurt W. Ritter
Indiana University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kurt W. Ritter

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Debut Program
Public Address Division
Speech Communication Association Convention
December 30, 1972
Chicago

CS 500 123

As the bicentennial of the American Revolution approaches, the oratory and polemic literature of that conflict promise to become popular subjects of interpretation by rhetorical critics. The sheer volume of this rhetorical discourse poses special problems of methodology and focus to the critic. By 1775 there were thirty-eight newspapers in the American colonies "crowded with columns of arguments and counter-arguments" in the forms of essays, sermons, official documents and speeches. By 1783 over 1500 pamphlets relating to the Anglo-American struggle had been published.[1]

The rhetoric of the Revolution constitutes one of the most significant bodies of American public address, but how can it be most profitably studied? Recent rhetorical criticism of the Revolution reflects the assumptions of two different schools of American historiography.[2] Harry P. Kerr's study of fast and thanksgiving sermons and Michael Weatherly's examination of Revolutionary orators[3] share the propaganda orientation of "progressive" historians Philip Davidson and John C. Miller, who produced the classic studies of American Revolutionary persuasion.[4] However, Kerr's subsequent study of election sermons and Harold D. Mixon's article on a similar topic[5] adopt an approach similar to the "consensus" or "idealist" school of historians headed by Edmund S. Morgan. Morgan maintains that the significance of anti-British agitation in the American

colonies "lies in the emergence, not of [propaganda] leaders and methods and organizations, but of well-defined constitutional principles."[6]

While the propaganda and idealist approaches have yielded revealing studies, each approach is fragmentary and provides a less than satisfying orientation for rhetorical criticism. The propaganda approach implies that Revolutionary leaders fed carefully concocted pieces of persuasion to a passive audience. It focuses on technique and draws attention away from substance. In short, it reduces the rhetoric of the American Revolution to "mere" rhetoric. These limitations have convinced historian Bernard Bailyn that "the whole idea of propaganda in its modern meaning" is misleading "when applied to the writings of the American Revolution."[7] In contrast, the idealist approach focuses only on calm and well-reasoned constitutional arguments, such as those found in quasi-political sermons. It ignores the propagandistic aspects of the Revolutionary rhetoric and does not account for the more frenzied rhetoric, which often involved fervent appeals to a unique American character and destiny.[8]

The present article offers an alternative critical perspective on the rhetoric of the American Revolution which draws on the writings of historians Bernard Bailyn and Gordon S. Wood and rhetorical critics Paul D. Brandes and Arthur L. Smith.[9] This approach accepts Bailyn's argument that the Revolutionary rhetoric was more than just propaganda, that it "meant something very real" to its rhetors and auditors. At the same time, the approach discussed here recognizes that agitational or propagandistic strategies, such as those outlined by Smith in the Rhetoric of Black

Revolution, did operate in the Revolutionary rhetoric. Specifically, the present study suggests a critical approach focusing on the notion of myth-making in the rhetoric of the American Revolution and provides a case study in this method by examining the persuasive literature of Francis Hopkinson, a leading Revolutionary spokesman.

The Myth-Making Function

Arthur L. Smith describes the two basic dimensions of revolutionary rhetoric as aggression and unification. Aggressive rhetoric is served by three rhetorical strategies: (1) vilification--verbal attack on an opposition leader, (2) objectification--verbal attack on the opposition in general, and (3) legitimation--justification of revolutionary acts by blaming the opposition for creating situations which mandated a violent response. Unifying rhetoric is served primarily by a strategy of mythication in which the revolutionary agitator "creates a spiritual dynamism for his movement" through appeals which suggest "the sanction of supra-rational forces." The mythication strategy, Smith explains, "is primarily exhortative in the sense that it becomes a type of group self-congratulation by the agitator in order to inspire them to greater dedication."[10]

Smith treats mythication as a conscious and deliberate tool of revolutionists. But speakers may not always recognize the mythication function of their own rhetoric.[11] As Paul Brandes observes in The Rhetoric of Revolt, much revolutionary rhetoric "stems from the revolutionary's need for identification, because, in the process of divorcing himself from the images of the past, he welcomes new symbols to restore his security

[emphasis added]."[12] In addition, if revolutionary rhetors believe their own rhetoric, it must influence them as well as their auditors. They become controlled by the very appeals they employ. Political scientist Max J. Skidmore speaks to this point when he observes that "historically, Americans more often seem to have been the prisoners of their words, rather than cynical manipulators using language for political advantage."[13] Myth-making, then, might be more properly considered a function of revolutionary rhetoric, rather than a planned strategy of the rhetor.

Whereas aggressive rhetoric, in Smith's sense, is dependent on a particular enemy whose actions are interpreted in terms of the immediate revolutionary context, unification rhetoric, through the use of mythication, transcends the immediate situation. Because it tends to modify the world view of the revolutionaries and to construct a shared ideology, such rhetoric can have a profound influence on shaping national self-consciousness and creating a national ethos. It may, indeed, be the foundation upon which future rhetoric is built--in a sense, the genesis of a truly national rhetoric. If this is the case, then the study of the mythication function of American Revolutionary rhetoric could prove a most fruitful area of investigation for the rhetorical critic.[14]

Myth-Making and the American Identity

The rhetorical literature of the American Revolution and early national period, although created for specific political purposes, also reveals the rhetors' perceptions of America and their attempts to communicate that vision to their audience. Brandes suggests that because "the symbols of

the Old Regime" no longer belong to the revolutionary, he experiences "a void"; he is "always lonely, no matter how much he protests to the contrary. Through his rhetoric he seeks companionship."[15] Hence, the question of American identity became one of the major themes in the early republic's "literature of persuasion" as Revolutionary propagandists sought to fill out the meaning of "America"--a vague symbol increasingly employed in the two decades preceding the Revolution.[16]

The question of American identity centered on how Americans perceived themselves. What did they feel united them? What characteristics did they regard as uniquely theirs? And what destiny did they imagine for their young country? By attempting to resolve these questions, the rhetoric of the American Revolution fulfilled a mythication function not dissimilar to the present day Black revolutionists' creation of a Black identity among American Negros.[17]

The strategies of aggressive rhetoric may also be employed to support the mythication function. In order to bolster morale and win over the "trimmers" who hesitated between the Loyalist and Patriot camps, Revolutionary spokesmen both attacked the enemy and attempted to promote American unity. The British themselves acknowledged "that the rebels . . . had some d-mn'd good writers on their side of the question."[18] Certainly one of those "d-mn'd good writers" was Francis Hopkinson, who has been characterized by literary historian Bruce Granger as "the foremost essayist of the Revolution."[19] Hopkinson, a member of the colonial aristocracy and Philadelphia's intellectual elite, could be considered something of a

minor Franklin for he demonstrated talents as a writer, musician, lawyer, businessman, scientist, Patriot and statesman.[20]

Hopkinson fought for the American cause with a spectacular arsenal of rhetorical weapons, including orations, sermons, ballads, theatrical productions, newspaper letters, and both allegorical and satirical prose and poetry. His Revolutionary rhetoric provides materials for a revealing study of the struggle for an American identity; it suggests an implicit as well as a conscious effort to define America and Americans. Hopkinson's persuasive efforts exemplify the mythication function and show how aggressive strategies are interwoven with it.

Hopkinson's rhetorical works reveal both the author and his audience. His rhetoric contains what Edwin Black calls "the second persona"--the American auditor implied by his discourse, the "beckoning archtype" of the new American.[21] To be effective, Hopkinson had to link support for the Revolution with the beliefs of his American public, while at the same time reinterpreting and restructuring their beliefs in order to create a new self-awareness. One of his principle vehicles for accomplishing these goals was political satire, which, by virtue of its indirection, gained access to a broader audience than did his harsher propaganda.

Kenneth Burke maintains that "critical or imaginative works are answers to questions posed by the situation in which they arose. They are not merely answers, they are <u>strategic</u> answers, <u>stylized</u> answers." "Every document bequeathed to us by history," Burke continues, "must be treated as a <u>strategy for encompassing a situation</u>."[22] If one accepts

Burke's point of view, then Hopkinson's rhetoric must be considered not only as deliberate persuasion but also as a less conscious attempt to resolve the personal problem of an American identity.

Hopkinson exemplifies the new American seeking a national identity. Prior to the Revolution, he viewed himself as a loyal and proud citizen of the British Empire. Given his background and the pro-British sentiments expressed in his early writings, it is surprising that he did not become a Loyalist. He had many Tory connections whose favor he could ill afford to lose, including his cousin by marriage, Lord North, George III's prime minister.[23]

Yet despite his strong ties with England, Hopkinson embraced the American Revolution. As a representative of New Jersey he signed the Declaration of Independence and served in the Revolutionary government. He also designed the American flag and submitted a plan for the Great Seal of the United States.[24]

Hopkinson's transformation from loyal subject to ardent Patriot paralleled American political development which moved from loyal addresses to the crown to the Declaration of Independence.[25] In 1762 he expressed his honest affection for England with an ode in honor of George III's accession to the throne. Only fifteen years later Hopkinson renounced his king, characterizing him as a "faithless boy" who lusted after America.[26] This budding revolutionist who had once thought of himself as British now had to discover what it was that made him an American. Such a need was common to his contemporaries and its resolution essential to the establishment of a

national identity. Hopkinson's rhetoric contributed to a mythication function which filled this void and thus formed an important part of American Revolutionary persuasion.

His speeches and writings between 1774 and 1778 reflect a drastic change in his notion of how America was tied to England. Before the Revolution he defined America in terms of its "child-parent" relationship with Britain--but by 1778 he invoked the power of myth by symbolizing America as an orphan child of God, ordained to be the new host of the "Goddess Freedom." This transformation permitted the assertion of a separate national character, a distinct American people.[27]

Asserting an American Character

As one scholar of the American character notes, "no special acuity was needed to perceive that [Revolutionary] America consisted of a patchwork of peoples who were not yet accustomed to thinking of themselves, either collectively or individually, as Americans."[28] Hopkinson seems to have appreciated the importance of an American identity to the success of the war and the future of the nation. To destroy the British identity of Americans, he employed the aggressive strategies of ridicule and invective, while, at the same time, pursuing a unifying strategy through unabashed patriotic self-congratulation of Americans.

Smith observes that the mythication function in revolutionary rhetoric "always operates for a specific group that can be defined to the exclusion of others. The rhetor who employs mythication gives his audience a feeling of particularity."[29] By poking fun at the British, Hopkinson helped to

dispel Americans' "colonial-minded" awe of England. While other literary propagandists such as Philip Freneau aroused bitter hatred against England, Hopkinson often humorously belittled her and contrasted what he considered the national characters of Englishmen and Americans.[30]

A call for a sense of American-ness dominated much of Hopkinson's Revolutionary rhetoric. He chided those Americans who looked up to the English "as patterns of perfection in all things." Colonial rule, he maintained, had produced a shameful dependence on English taste and thought. Instead of aping their British enemies, Hopkinson asserted, Americans should "hold them and their conduct in utter abhorrence."[31]

Hopkinson's works abound with comparisons and contrasts designed to destroy the British ethos and establish a favorable American identity. He portrayed Americans as more vigorous, more practical, and more intellectually inquiring than Englishmen. In his allegorical prose American settlers were represented as "adventurers," "more stout and enterprising" than their English cousins. The American nation he likened to "a young vigorous tree" which replaced the "rotten tree" of British rule.[32]

Americans, he noted, "turn their hands to everything; their situation obliges them to do so. A farmer cannot run to an artist upon every trifling occasion--He must make and mend and contrive for himself." While Americans were self-reliant and sensible, the English were devoid even of rationality: "The general character of the English is certainly the most fanatic and absurd that ever fell to the lot of any known nation."[33] Hopkinson's humorous ballad, "The Battle of the Kegs," celebrated American

ingenuity and British ineptitude at waging war. Widely published and sung to the tune of Yankee Doodle, the ballad became one of the most popular camp songs of the Revolution.[34]

With obvious glee, Hopkinson further insisted that Americans were generally more knowledgeable and intellectually inquiring than Englishmen. He expressed shock at the "extreme ignorance of the common people [of England] " who knew only their "particular branch of business." Little England, he scorned, was the Britisher's universe.[35]

"It is quite otherwise in America," Hopkinson announced. "The lowest tradesman there is not without some degree of general knowledge." Public libraries were found in many towns and all cities; "not a shoemaker or a taylor but will find time to read." The American "acquires knowledge imperceptibly and gets a love for books." He is a man who knows his rights, "studies the first principles of government" and "amuses himself with a little astronomy. . . . Such are the people of England and such the people of America."[36] For colonists who had once gloried in the name "Englishman," Hopkinson provided the far superior designation of "American."

The American Destiny

Revolutionary rhetoric rejected America's British past as a basis for American identity. Hopkinson's persuasive efforts evidence an attempt both to particularize his American audience cut adrift from its heritage and to create a "spiritual dynamism" by seizing upon the glorious American destiny as the focus of national cohesion.[37]

The future glory of America became an article of faith with Hopkinson, and apparently with his audience as well. In a theatrical production most distinguished for its undiluted patriotism, Hopkinson had the goddess Minerva praise Columbia in six tortured stanzas and then proclaim "The Gods decree/ That she shall be/ A nation great confess."[38] America was destined to be the home of liberty, the generator of genius, and a center of commerce.

Hopkinson liberally sprinkled the words "liberty" and "freedom" throughout his works. In one of his camp ballads he announced that "Fair Freedom," who had previously "in Britain her throne erected, / . . . forsook the base nation, / And fixed on our mountains, a more honor'd station." America had won "a naked goddess" and the federal constitution would clothe this goddess Liberty "in robes of social happiness."[39]

As the home of liberty, America would stimulate genius as no despotic country could. Hopkinson conceived of "genius," not in terms of an individual's mental endowment, but rather as a kind of supra-rational force destined to flourish on the vast American continent. "The eyes of Europe," he asserted, "look toward us as a country that may be a great nursery of arts and sciences." "The very climate" of America encouraged "the production of genius."[40]

Along with genius would grow a vigorous commerce based on a harmony of farming and manufacturing. The farmer and the tradesman, according to Hopkinson, stood as "the pillars of national happiness and prosperity." God had "stamped a peculiar value upon agriculture and

mechanical arts in America" by selecting Washington and Franklin as its great Revolutionary leaders.[41]

While strongly felt and warmly received, Hopkinson's concept of the American destiny remained somewhat vague and incomplete. Perhaps he best captured his imprecise vision of the American future in a single stanza which he included in both an ode and an oration:

> Science shall flourish--Genius stretch her wing,
> In native strains Columbian Muses sing:
> Wealth crown the Arts, and Justice cleanse her scales,
> Commerce her pond'rous anchor weigh
> Wide spread her sails,
> And in far distant seas her flag display.[42]

For all its lack of specificity, this rhetoric was directed toward creating a vision with which Hopkinson's peculiarly American audience could identify.

Curiously, contemporary critics lauded Hopkinson only for his aggressive rhetoric of "irresistible ridicule."[43] Apparently they were too closely involved in Revolutionary persuasion to appreciate the equally important function of his rhetoric as a unifying force in the new nation. From the perspective of two centuries, Hopkinson's significant contributions to the rhetoric of the American Revolution appear to be not only his ridicule of the enemy, but also his articulation of a uniquely American character and destiny. To employ Richard Weaver's rhetorical lexicon, Hopkinson helped to elevate the words "liberty," "genius," and "commerce" to the

status of "ultimate terms" or "uncontested terms" of Revolutionary America. Symbols of this sort might be considered "a common denominator" uniting Americans and giving them a special identity.[44]

Hopkinson's rhetoric was not at all unusual. Similar appeals to a unique American character and destiny echoed from other Revolutionary spokesmen and the seeds of these appeals can be traced back to the sermons and tracts of the colonial settlement period.[45] More important, the mythication themes which flowered in the rhetoric of the Revolution continued to grow during at least the next hundred years of American patriotic oratory.[46]

Consequently, I would submit that in order to grasp the full significance of American Revolutionary rhetoric, scholars should focus their attention on the myth-making function operating in that rhetoric. The rhetoric of the American Revolution was more than manipulated propaganda and borrowed abstractions; it expressed ideas with personal significance to its rhetors and auditors--ideas with perhaps lasting impact on the future development of American public address.

If rhetorical critics wish to join in the search for "the ethos of America beneath the surface of its literature,"[47] they might profitably examine the rhetoric of the American Revolution for the notion of America which Revolutionary rhetors worked so feverishly to communicate to their fellow Americans.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Bernard Bailyn, The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 1, 8.

[2]For critical reviews of the historiography of the American Revolution, see Gordon S. Wood's important essay, "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Ser., 23 (Jan. 1966), 3-32; Bernard Bailyn, The Origins of American Politics (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), pp. 3-14; and Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., ed., The American Revolution: The Crucial Issues (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), pp. vii-xiv.

[3]Kerr, "Politics and Religion in Colonial Fast and Thanksgiving Sermons, 1763-1783," QJS, 47 (Dec. 1960), 372-382; and Weatherly, "Propaganda and the Rhetoric of the American Revolution," Southern Speech Journal, 36 (Summer 1971), 353-363.

[4]Davidson, Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), and Miller, Samuel Adams: Pioneer in Propaganda (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1936).

[5]Kerr, "The Election Sermon: Primer for Revolutionaries," Speech Monographs, 29 (March 1962), 13-22; and Mixon, "Boston's Artillery Election Sermons and the American Revolution," Speech Monographs, 34

(March 1967), 43-50.

[6]Edmund S. Morgan and Helen M. Morgan, The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution, rev. ed. (New York: Collier Books, 1963), p. 369.

[7]Ideological Origins of the American Revolution, p. ix. Bailyn came to this conclusion through a study of over 400 Revolutionary pamphlets; also see Wood, "Rhetoric and Reality," pp. 7-10, 31.

[8]The school of historical interpretation identified with Edmund S. Morgan's writings on the Revolution has been variously labeled "neo-Whig," "idealist," and "consensus." For an explanation and critique of this interpretation, see Wood, "Rhetoric and Reality," pp. 15-21.

[9]In addition to the works by Bailyn and Wood previously cited, see Bailyn, ed. Pamphlets of the American Revolution: 1750-1776, I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Wood, The Creation of the American Republic 1776-1787 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969); Brandes, The Rhetoric of Revolt (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1971); and Smith, Rhetoric of Black Revolution (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969). Like Bailyn and Brandes, I am considering the political rhetoric of the troubled period between the end of the war and the ratification of the federal constitution as an integral part of American Revolutionary rhetoric.

[10]Rhetoric of Black Revolution, pp. 4-5, 26, 34, 37. Smith first developed this taxonomy of revolutionary rhetoric in his doctoral disserta-

tion, "Samuel Adams' Agitational Rhetoric of Revolution," UCLA, 1968.

[11]Although Smith does note that these "devices" are "not always consciously contrived in an agitator's rhetoric," his subsequent discussion of mythication considers it only as a rhetorical technique under the direct control of the agitator (Rhetoric of Black Revolution, pp. 26, 34-40).

[12]p. 4.

[13]Word Politics: Essays on Language and Politics (Palo Alto, Calif.: James E. Freel and Assoc., 1972), p. 3.

[14]For an analysis of the interaction between language and national character, see James R. Andrews, "Reflections of the National Character in American Rhetoric," QJS, 57 (Oct. 1971), 316-324.

[15]pp. 5, 8.

[16]Edwin H. Cady, ed., Literature of the Early Republic, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), pp. 3-4. Recent studies of the symbolism of early American nationalism include: Paul A. Varg, "The Advent of Nationalism, 1758-1776," American Quarterly, 16 (Summer, 1964), 160-181; Richard Merrett, "The Emergence of American Nationalism: A Quantitative Approach," American Quarterly, 17 (Summer, 1965), 319-335; and E. McClung Fleming, "Symbols of the United States: From Indian Queen to Uncle Sam," in Frontiers of American Culture, ed. by Ray B. Browne, et al. (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University

Studies, 1968), pp. 1-24.

[17]For discussions of the function of Black identity in Black revolutionary rhetoric, see Smith, Rhetoric of Black Revolution, pp. 34-40, 59-61, and James L. Golden and Richard D. Rieke, The Rhetoric of Black Americans (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 497-502.

[18]United States Magazine, January, 1779, pp. 3-4.

[19]Political Satire in the American Revolution, 1763-1783 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1960), p. 23.

[20]Dixon Wecter, "Francis Hopkinson and Benjamin Franklin," American Literature, 12 (May, 1940), 200-217. The most thorough study of Hopkinson is George Everett Hastings, The Life and Works of Francis Hopkinson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926), cited hereafter as Hastings, Hopkinson.

[21]"The Second Persona," QJS, 56 (April 1970), 113, 119.

[22]The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1941), pp. 1, 109.

[23]Through Lord North Hopkinson obtained two positions with the Crown shortly before the Revolution: the collector of customs for the port of New Castle on the Delaware River in April, 1772, and a seat on the King's Council of the Province of New Jersey in May, 1774; Hastings, Hopkinson, pp. 166-167, 170.

[24]During the war Hopkinson served as chairman of the Continental Navy Board, Treasurer of Loans for the United States, and Judge of Admiralty for Pennsylvania; Hastings, Hopkinson, pp. 212-213, 218-220, 234, 240-257; and Hastings, "Francis Hopkinson and the American Flag," General Magazine and Historical Chronicle, 42 (Oct. 1939), 45-63.

[25]For example, James R. Andrews has traced this shift in "The Rhetoric of a Lobbyist: Benjamin Franklin in England, 1765-1775," Central States Speech Journal, 18 (Nov. 1967), 262-263, 266-267.

[26]"An Exercise: Containing a Dialogue and Ode on the Accession of his Present Gracious Majesty George III--Performed at a Public Commencement in the College of Philadelphia, May 1762," in Hopkinson, The Miscellaneous Essays and Occasional Writings of Francis Hopkinson, Esq. (Philadelphia: T. Dobson, 1792), Vol. III, Part II, pp. 83-88, cited hereafter as Hopkinson, Essays; and "Date Obolum Relesario," Pennsylvania Packet, April 22, 1778. In his later years Hopkinson revised most of his works and republished them in his Essays (1792); however, wherever possible I have quoted from the original works which possess the vigorous style of a revolutionary spokesman rather than the cautious language of an aging Federalist. For a comparison of these two styles, see "Letter to Joseph Galloway," in the Pennsylvania Packet, Jan. 21, 1775, and the revised version in his Essays, I, 127-131.

[27]This change in American symbolism can be observed in the following five works by Hopkinson: (1) The Old Farm and the New Farm:

A Political Allegory, with introduction and historical notes by Benson J. Lossing (1774 rpt., New York: Dana and Company, 1858), which is a reprint of Hopkinson's A Pretty Story Written in the Year of Our Lord 1774 by Peter Grievous, Esq., A.B.C.D.E. (Philadelphia: John Dunlap, 1774), cited hereafter as Hopkinson, A Pretty Story; (2) "On the Late Continental Fast," Pennsylvania Magazine, July 1775, pp. 309-310; (3) "A Prophecy," written about April 1776, and included in Hopkinson, Essays, I, 92-97; (4) a sermon delivered on the Colonies' Day of Fasting and Prayer, May 15, 1776 (excerpts published in Hastings, Hopkinson, pp. 205-206); and (5) "Date Obolum Relesario," Pennsylvania Packet, April 22, 1778.

[28]Michael McGiffert, ed., The Character of Americans: A Book of Readings (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1964), pp. v-vi.

[29]Smith, Rhetoric of Black Revolution, p. 40.

[30]Moses Coit Tyler, The Literary History of the American Revolution, 1763-1783 (1897 rpt., New York: Frederick Unger Co., 1957), II, 141-157; and Davidson, p. 352.

[31]Letter from "A.B.," Pennsylvania Packet, June 18, 1785; and letter from "A.B.," Pennsylvania Packet, Nov. 19, 1778.

[32]Hopkinson, A Pretty Story, pp. 20-21; and "A Prophecy," Hopkinson, Essays, I, 96.

[33]"Translation of a Letter Written by a Foreigner on his Travels,"

Pennsylvania Packet, Feb. 4, 1777.

[34]"The Battle of the Kegs," Pennsylvania Packet, March 4, 1778; Hastings, Hopkinson, p. 295; and James Thatcher, Military Journal During the American Revolutionary War (Hartford, Conn.: Silas Andrus and Son, 1854), p. 204.

[35]"Translation of a Letter Written by a Foreigner on his Travels," Pennsylvania Packet, Feb. 4, 1777.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Hopkinson explicitly celebrated the American destiny in two theatrical productions. The first, The Temple of Minerva, was a semi-operatic allegory in two scenes performed in Philadelphia on Dec. 11, 1781, before a small private audience which included George Washington and his wife. Hopkinson promptly published the libretto as "The Temple of Minerva: An Oratorical Entertainment," Freeman's Journal, Dec. 19, 1781. The second production, "The Grand Federal Procession," was in reality a spectacular parade--a patriotic pageant--performed at Philadelphia on July 4, 1788, which featured national symbols through the use of banners, slogans, emblems, floats, orations and odes. See "An Account of the Grand Federal Procession," Pennsylvania Gazette, July 9, 1788; and "Observations on the Federal Procession," American Museum, July, 1788, pp. 75-78.

[38]"The Temple of Minerva," Freeman's Journal, Dec. 19, 1781.

[39]"The Ode," in "An Account of the Grand Federal Procession," Pennsylvania Packet, July 9, 1788.

[40]"An Address to the American Philosophical Society, Held at Philadelphia, For Promoting Useful Knowledge, Delivered January 16, 1784," Hopkinson, Essays, I, 360-361, 366.

[41]"Observations on the Federal Procession," American Museum, July 1788, p. 76.

[42]"The Ode" in "An Account of the Grand Federal Procession," Pennsylvania Packet, July 9, 1788; and "On the Establishment of the New Constitution for the United States of America," Hopkinson, Essays, II, 66.

[43] [Benjamin Rush], "Account of the late Francis Hopkinson," Massachusetts Magazine, Dec. 1791, p. 751.

[44]The Ethics of Rhetoric (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), pp. 164-185, 211-232. Also see Brandes, p. 5.

[45]See Bailyn, Ideological Origins of the American Revolution, pp. 22, 32, 141; and Richard W. Van Alstyne, The Genesis of American Nationalism (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1970), p. 4.

[46]Rhetorical critic Howard H. Martin and historian Robert P. Hay have both sketched the themes of America's unique character and destiny in fourth of July oratory from 1777 to 1877; see Martin, "The Fourth of July Oration," QJS, 44 (Dec. 1958), 393-401; and Hays, "The Liberty

Tree: A Symbol for American Patriots," QJS, 55 (Dec. 1969), 414-424. Also see Van Alstyne's discussion of "The Revolution and its Mythology," in The Genesis of American Nationalism, pp. 53-114.

[47]Leon Howard, Literature and the American Tradition (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1960), p. 5.

N.B. In this paper, the author's term "myth-making" is used interchangably with Arthur L. Smith's term "mythication."